

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR092/KE

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are requested to be cancelled.

No claims are currently being amended.

No claims are being added.

This amendment does not add, change and/or delete claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

In paragraphs 1-4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-6, 8-15 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,498,592 (Matthies) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,252,564 (Albert). The Examiner states:

***Regarding claim 1.*** Matthies discloses a display system, comprising:

A plurality of tiles (Figure 1),

Each tile of the tiles including a matrix of pixel elements (Column 4, lines 30-35),

The pixel elements selectively providing light at a first surface (Column 5, lines 6-12) of the tile in response to address signals,

Via contacts at a second surface (Column 5, lines 30-37),

The first surface being opposite the second surface (Figure 3, items 526 and 516; and

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR092/KE

A medium having a mounting surface, the plurality of tiles being attached to or above the mounting surface (Column 7, lines 38-41),

Matthies fails to teach wherein the contacts extend below the second surface and are coupled to the pixel elements, wherein the contacts are disposed between rib structures.

Albert et al. disclose a display system wherein contacts extend below a second surface and are coupled to pixel elements, wherein the contacts are disposed between rib structures (Figure 5E and column 13, lines 22-44. The examiner interprets that the display medias 46 are the pixel elements, where vias 94 are the contacts which extend below a second surface 92 and are coupled to the pixel elements 46, and that vias 60 are rib structures in which the contacts are disposed between).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the structure taught by Albert et al. with the display system taught by Matthies in order to achieve a highly-flexible reflective display which can be manufactured easily, consume little power, and can, therefore, be incorporated into a variety of applications.

The pixel elements being coupled to an address circuit (Figure 2, item 22 and Column 8, lines 52-56)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's interpretation of the conductive via and associated components in Albert.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 16 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Matthies in view of Albert and U.S. Patent No. 5,805,117 (Mazurek). The Examiner states:

*Regarding claim 2*, Matthies and Albert et al. disclose the display system of claim 1.

Matthies and Albert et al. fail to teach wherein the medium is transparent and the tiles are mounted so that the first surface is closer to the mounting surface than the second surface.

Mazurek et al. discloses wherein the medium is transparent (Figure 3, item 330 and Column 7, lines 33-36) and the tiles are mounted

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR092/KE

so that the first surface is closer to the mounting surface than the second surface (Figure 3, items 330 and 100. The examiner interprets the global glass cover, item 330, to be part of the mounting surface wherein the first surface of item 100 would be closer to item 330 than the second surface).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matthies, Albert et al. and Mazurek in order to provide for a display device that would be more take up less space in situations where space is a commodity.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Matthies in view of Albert and U.S. Patent No. 6,849,935 (Palanisamy). The Examiner states:

*Regarding claim 7*, Matthies and Albert et al. disclose the display system of claim 6. Matthies also discloses wherein the interposer is a flexible circuit board (Column 2, lines 50-52).

Matthies and Albert et al. fail to teach of the display system of claim 6, wherein the interposer is coupled to the interconnect member of flexible leads.

Palanisamy teaches of the display system of claim 6, wherein the interposer is coupled to the interconnect member of flexible leads (Figure 1A, items 114 and column 4, lines 10-17. the examiner interprets that if the flexible leads are made of a conductive elastomer that they would be flexible).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Matthies, Albert et al. and Palanisamy in order to provide for the flexibility of the entire display system such that it could be shaped to fit its use.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Albert, Mazurek, Matthies, or Palanisamy are referred to below as the cited art.

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR092/KE

As discussed in the previous response to Office Action, each of independent claims 1, 8, 11, 13, 16 and 19 recite limitations related to the contacts or conductive vias associated with pixel elements according to varying scopes. Applicants respectfully submit that such contacts and/or conductive vias are not shown, described or suggested as being between rib structures in the cited art. The rib structures advantageously define an area for contact and/or conductive via placements.

The Examiner does not rely on Mazurek, Matthies, or Palanisamy to suggest rib structures. The Examiner has also failed to identify rib structures in Albert. Instead, the Examiner interprets the conductive vias of Albert as rib structures. However, conductive vias of Albert are just that - conductive vias.

The conductive vias of Albert are not rib structures for the purpose of defining an area in which a contact or via can be provided. In fact, the contacts and conductive vias of Albert are merely provided between other contacts and conductive vias. Contacts and conductive vias have an entirely different purpose than rib structures.

Conductive via 60 of Albert is more synonymous with conductor 84 of the present application. Indeed, the purpose of the rib structure is to define a locus for the contact or via. The rib structure advantageously spatially separates contacts and vias from other contacts. There is no such separation if the rib structure is a conductive vias. Therefore, the conductive vias of Albert do not serve the advantageous purpose of the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7, independent claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-10, independent claim 11 and its dependent claim 12, independent claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-15, independent claim 16 and its dependent claims 17-18 and independent claim 19 and its dependent claim 20 are patentable over the cited art.

\* \* \* \* \*

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR092/KE

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 13, 2006

By Kyle Eppele

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.  
400 Collins Road, NE  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-8280  
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777  
Customer No. 26383

Kyle Eppele  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,155